

TO: HUGH MORROW
FROM: NANCY MAGINNIS
SUBJECT: DRAFT #4 OF THE AMERICAN DREAM
DATE: AUGUST 18, 1971

While the paper has some interesting insights, there is a lack of historical perspective which leads to distortions of both historical concepts and facts and which, in the final analysis, weakens the author's argument.

1. The Police State of the 18th Century

- a. The section asserting that the 18th century was one in which police states existed is misleading.
- b. The salient point about 18th century monarchy is that it was weak. Ruling by "divine right", the 18th century monarch could not claim a popular base. Encumbered by traditions and customs, the king could not affront various "privileges". The result was that the ruler was unable to levy income taxes, etc. The essence of the 18th century state was its weakness not its strength.

2. Comparison Between the French and American Revolution

- a. Although the point that the American Revolution was rooted in a religious concept and the French one was based on the worship of "Reason" is an interesting one, it is perhaps more relevant to consider other differences.
- b. The major difference between the two revolutions was that the French Revolution was an attack on the bases of French society while the American Revolution accepted the British intellectual and socio-economic traditions on which American society was based. The American Revolution was directed against a particular king and specific legislation.

- 1) In reality the nature of the American Revolution was profoundly different from that of France's. The American Revolution was directed against an "outside" political force; it did not seek to alter the internal structure of American society nor reject the traditions on which that society was founded. Even the Revolution's intellectual basis of "natural rights" was more the argument of an accomplished Revolution than the Rousseauistic "call to action" philosophy of the French Revolution. On the most pragmatic level the Revolution was the result of the incompetence of British authority and the unique historical experience which produced an "American" akin to but not synonymous with a British subject.
- 2) The French Revolution period of 1789 to 1814 should be viewed as the culminatory phase of several interlocking and interacting revolutions. The Revolution was, in effect, several revolutions and, as a result had quite different effects than the American one.
- c. The major point to be made in any comparison of the outcomes of the two Revolutions is that the French Revolution, unlike the American one, did not produce a powerfully-unifying national myth. Instead, the French Revolution unleashed irreconcilable forces within that society so that, in a major sense, the French Revolution was an incomplete one. The French Revolution did produce different revolutionary strands which divided the nation on the nature and goals of society.
- d. It would be more meaningful to discuss the American Civil War vis-a-vis the French Revolution rather than to compare the two revolutions.
3. Marxism/Communism and The French Revolution

There seems to be some confusion over (1) Hitler's totalitarian state (2) the Marxist and Communist state and (3) the roots of both in the French Revolution.

 - a. While there is a strand of State Socialism which emerged from the French Revolution it has little to do with the "Supreme Being" and pseudomystical leader worship which is, in any case, more a typical and conscious development of Nazism than Communism or Socialism.

- b. The strand emerging from the French Revolution can be traced to Rousseau's idea of "man is born free and he is everywhere in chains." It was implemented by Robespierre, The Commune and The Reign of Terror. The central doctrine of Jacobin politics was the omnipotence of the state and, in terms of historical experience, one can compare Robespierre's "despotism of liberty over tyranny" to Lenin's "dictatorship of the proletariat."

-- This is not the same, however, as correlating the concept of a "Supreme Being" with that of the development of leader worship -- which, in any case, is not an attribute of Communism.

- c. It is equally suspect to treat Chinese and Russian Communism within the framework of the French Revolution. Without going into a detailed historical analysis, it is fair to say that Russian and Chinese Communism are the results of the peculiar histories of those nations -- both of which were removed from the mainstream of West European thought -- and each of which differs, substantially, from the other.

4. Brotherhood and The Economic System

- a. The paper argues that a more equitable economic system would be the most effective way of fostering brotherhood.
- b. This is based on the Marxian premise that a change in economic systems can change not only society but man's nature. The weight of historical evidence is that the opposite is true, i.e. that man's concept of self, his ethical and moral standards determine his governmental and economic systems rather than vice-versa. Industrialization in the 19th century did not determine the responses of the various modern states but was, in effect, absorbed and shaped by existing traditions, patterns and systems.
- c. I think that a causal relationship between brotherhood and economic systems is tenuous, at best.

11-4
5/1/77

THE AMERICAN DREAM

CHAPTER 7

If I were permitted but one sentence in which to express my concept of the American Dream, I would say it is the dream of building a society which offers the individual the greatest possible opportunity for finding fulfillment of his spiritual longings as well as of his material needs.

Such fulfillment is an essential part of man's right to pursue happiness, a right which from the beginning has been an integral part of the American Dream. The material needed for building the edifice of a truly humane society is complex beyond imagination, but its main pillars are still the ancient ideals of freedom, equality and brotherhood.

- 1) Freedom from the oppression which humanity has inflicted on itself through the ages;
- 2) Equality before the law, and, as far as possible, equal opportunities for all willing to learn and to work;
- 3) Brotherhood based on the founding fathers' recognition that equal economic opportunity, mutual interdependence and removal of social barriers could eventually replace man's envy and mistrust of one another.

Naturally, the early settlers of this country were acquainted with the idea of brotherhood as a tenet of the Christian faith. Yet conditions prevalent in the countries of their origin had long since destroyed all hope that any form of government could be guided by such tenets.

The 18th century was a deeply troubled era. The fear of police informers was universal, sowing distrust between individual citizens. In France, ^{for example} the infamous lettres de cachet, often brought on by mere denunciation, are a vivid example of the insecurity affecting even members of the privileged classes. The eyes and ears of the government were everywhere, viewing with suspicion too close associations between individual citizens as possible breeding grounds for subversive factions.

Life looked different in the wilderness of the New World, where government was too remote to offer either threat or protection. And the country in its vastness, its awe-inspiring grandeur and elemental power was a totally new experience for the settler from abroad. Individuals had to join hands against the ever present dangers, common enemies and all the terror of the unknown. Even in the absence of danger, the mere necessities of life, like building cabins, care of the sick, harvesting crops, made man dependent on his neighbor and eventually his friend and brother.

Thus, the transcendental ideal of brotherhood became a tangible reality. Its spirit started to take root. In ever expanding circles it moved from neighbor to communities, to states

- 3 -

and to a new nation, endowing it with a vitality unknown to the old world.

It found expression in the near ¹⁴⁾pure democracy of the New England town meetings, in the "unite or die" sentiments that ~~gave birth to the American Revolution~~ ^{gave birth to the American Revolution}, in the reaching out for an effective federal system of government once the colonial states had won their freedom from England.

So it was that, where political units in the old countries had found it almost unthinkable to give up any part of their sovereignty voluntarily, the American concept of brotherhood opened the way for the fledgling American colonies to trust and to help one another, just as individuals had done in the earlier colonial days. Consequently, the colonies felt secure enough to relinquish some of their power and thus, maybe for the first time in history, laid the foundations for a vast empire held together not by force, not by fear, but by the idea of mutual trust and a common sense of purpose.

The principles of freedom, equality and brotherhood on which the American Dream is based are identical, on the surface at least, to the liberte, egalite, fraternite which were proclaimed as the goals of the French Revolution in the same century. And still there is a subtle but all-important difference -- one that was to have a fundamental influence on the course of world history.

What was this fateful difference between the underlying spirit of the American Dream and the French Revolution? I believe

goal

- 4 -

the difference lies primarily in the fact that the American Dream was firmly rooted in religious concepts. The early American saw man as a being with an immortal soul, no matter how much his religious tenets differed from those of his fellow citizens. The French ideologists, on the other hand, even where they still paid lip service to religion, considered man basically as a highly developed animal possessed of reason.

The "Goddess of Reason," whose temples were erected in place of desecrated churches in revolutionary France, was meant to replace the concept of the Judeo-Christian God. She was the representation of a kind of nature wisdom manifest everywhere in nature and reaching its peak in man's intellect. In contrast, American idealism, while cherishing the human intellect, would never have thought of replacing Divine wisdom with human reason. Moreover, the founders of the new country never saw man's ultimate goal in a paradise on earth. Nothing is more foreign to the fundamentally spiritual nature of the American Dream than gross materialism.

After undergoing many modifications, the philosophy leading to the French Revolution became the inspiration for Marxist/communistic ideologies. For the concept of an abstract, allegorical "Supreme Being" soon gave way to a pseudomystical leader worship. Since the human mind was considered the highest individual manifestation of an all-pervading divinity, people possessed of real or imagined genius began to look at themselves as rightful representatives of that deity. A hierarchy was to be created among men,

- 5 -

each of whom was to be equal "but some more equal than others."

(Orwell)

As a logical consequence, the French Revolution ended in terror. To remake man into a docile animal, the individualistically inclined were dealt with in a way similar to the elimination of untamable animals from the herd. In France, it was the guillotine. At a much later time, in Russia, Stalin's terror pursued similar goals. Most recently, the Cultural Revolution in China, after breaking the spirit of the individualist, is now assuming the most sophisticated methods of scientific conditioning and modern stock breeding.

In Mao's China, the world is going to witness the supreme test of the non-American dream: Can the human animal by methods of sophisticated reward and punishment, in other words by conditioning in the sense of Pavlov, form a contented, internally docile and externally powerful society? If man were indeed no more than a highly developed animal, this experiment could succeed and by its success refute the American Dream.

Yet failure of America's hopes need not come from outside but can be brought about by forces within the U.S. itself. For if present-day Americans disregard the spiritual nature of man, they themselves will destroy the very substance of which their dream is made.

Today, virtually all political leaders throughout the world, including those of our ideological opponents, claim belief

- 6 -

in the triad of freedom, equality and brotherhood. What distinguishes communist dialectics from our political philosophy is the concept of the nature of man and of the ways leading to his improvement. According to Lenin, Stalin and Mao, a just, free and fraternal society is an end product of human conditioning by human "stock breeders." According to Judeo-Christian ideals, it is the result of voluntary moral evolution of the individual, of the development of the individual's sense of purpose, and thus an issue between man and his Creator. Government, while entrusted with the responsibility of creating conditions best suited for that quest, can never force man to be free, just and brotherly.

If religious concepts hold any truth at all, the conditioning methods used in communist countries will end in failure. The necessity of unleashing a "Cultural Revolution" in Red China after only a few years of all-powerful communist rule has already illustrated that point, and it is not likely that its effect will last for long. Thus, if America holds on to its dream, its main opponent, China, will hardly be able to replace it as the hope of the world.

*Quite
the contrary*

For the American Dream to become a reality, however, we must clarify our own thinking as to our ideals and purposes and learn to think before acting. In a time when the speed of change leaves us breathless, in the midst of tremendous material growth, dreams can get lost in traffic jams, buried in pollution, or otherwise become obfuscated by the problems of the day.

- 7 -

Good will and good intentions are not enough. We must consciously articulate our ideas, clarify them and translate them into concepts --- and this demands first of all that we understand the meanings which lie behind those three key elements of the American Dream, freedom, equality and brotherhood.

Basically, they refer to three different psychological aspects of man. Unless this is realized, they will never take root in the community of men.

1. Freedom pertains basically to the mind, which can unfold its higher potential only if free of restrictions no longer relevant to our times.

But it would be a tragic mistake to believe that freedom can start with unrestricted actions. If everyone were to do as he pleases, he would by necessity interfere with the freedom of all. True freedom for all can only be achieved within a framework of laws -- laws which in turn should ideally be the fruits of free thought.

2. Equality concerns man's status before the law. It demands that everyone receive the same kind of justice and protection as all of his fellow citizens. And this requires perfection of the legal framework in order to safeguard freedom and pursue justice.

3. Brotherhood relates to man's love for his fellow man. The greatest gift of man is his capacity for love, compassion and brotherhood. This is the ingredient that makes our system different.

- 8 -

Education needs reorientation to nurture the seeds of brotherhood in small children, to place greater emphasis on the unfolding of spiritual and qualitative faculties as a basic objective of the learning process. But childhood education is merely a beginning; the capacity for love can only be perfected by voluntary self-education in adult life.

Government should not interfere with education beyond guaranteeing the right of every child to receive it. But freedom of education does not exclude the public servant as an individual from taking part in it. His role, however, must not be based on his power but on the respect won by his conduct in office.

Children today are far more alert to conditions in the world. Especially between the 7th and 14th year they are natural imitators and hero worshippers and will try to emulate public figures whom their parents admire. Thus public servants who have lived up to the responsibilities of their office could do an invaluable service to education by making their ideals and experiences available to youth. Professional educators, too, desperate for a more relevant and more fulfilling trend in education, would listen to the advice of men who have proven themselves on the testing grounds of modern politics.

The most effective way of fostering brotherhood within society is the development of an economic system more equitable to all. Such a system need not be in conflict with man's profit motive. On the contrary, it should become more realistic and therefore more profitable than our present one. The time is past

- 9 -

when economic exploitation by individuals or by nations can be of lasting benefit to anyone, since in a modern society the existence of poverty will inevitably destroy the wealth of all. Mushrooming welfare costs, taxes and riots will see to this.

Thus a revised economic system should take into consideration the fact that an affluent society cannot survive without acceptance of the concept of brotherhood as an integral part of our socio-economic philosophy.

Along with a better understanding of the meaning of freedom, equality and brotherhood, it is also essential to recognize that peoples differ in the degrees to which they value each of these three elements.

The French, maybe the most ingenious people of the new age, are impressed by brilliant reasoning. The logical result of this preference was from the beginning a somewhat one-sided, predominantly intellectual approach to their dream of a society ruled by reason. The Americans, who are a nation of pragmatists, tend to put action before thinking. Consequently, they marred their dream in an attempt to create happiness by material progress alone. Yet in accordance with the American concept of man as a spiritual being, progress should be measured by moral and cultural achievement rather than by material success.

The original settlers made America great by preferring the hardships of pioneer life to the far more profitable existence in cities. Even the gold rush was not motivated by greed alone. Its colorful history reveals a romantic longing for adventure

- 10 -

of a young, exuberant people ready to part with their treasures just as fast as they were acquired. ^{them}

For the American Dream to come true, a vivid awareness of its fundamental ideals is essential. Rapidly changing conditions necessitate modifications and adjustments in our approach to current events. But in all these adaptations we must not forget the sources ^{to which} ~~from where~~ this nation has ^{draws} ~~received~~ its strength.

^{men who wrote} The ~~inspirators~~ of our constitution were deeply intuitive people, capable of a vision that may still save the world. In the 200 years that have gone by, civilization has passed into a technological age which requires more clearly defined concepts.

The greatest vision of mankind since the Hellenic era has been the vision of freedom. Little progress has been made in the attainment of this age-old longing of man because freedom was too often sought in unrestricted action, and is today vainly being pursued in the area of emotions. But action must be restricted if a society is to survive, and emotions are forever influenced by elements outside the control of man's free will. The foundation of freedom, therefore, must be laid in the sphere of thinking.

The ancient Greeks were the first to recognize this fundamental truth. To assure objectivity in thinking, they brought it in tune with the objective truths of mathematics. For just as an airplane is not free to leave the ground unless its structure is adapted to the laws of physics, the human mind cannot free itself from its fetters unless it is in harmony with universal laws.

- 11 -

But the Greeks were also the inventors of democracy. They wanted free thinking to pervade eventually all aspects of human civilization. The dream of Hellas never materialized because the Greeks failed to translate their ideals into action.

The American Dream in a certain way is a revival of the ancient Greeks' concepts of a perfect democracy. As a people of action, we may be able to succeed where they failed. Before we act we must learn to think and to remember that, while freedom, justice and brotherhood are the indispensable pillars of an ideal society, neither of these principles can flourish outside its proper area. And none of them can survive for long if the other two are lagging behind.

Education of our children must affect the whole being, not just the intellect alone. It must teach them a more precise understanding of the main principles of society: Liberty is dependent on free thought. Equality requires a form of government that guarantees justice to all. A sense of brotherhood can develop ~~only~~ in a society whose economic life ~~is freed of political considerations and~~ takes into account the socio-economic interdependence of all.

Draft 3
9/7/71

CHAPTER 2

When Napoleon's rule drew to an end, the French Revolution had already run its course. The emperor, while putting a stop to all revolutionary activities at home, had nevertheless carried some of their fruits into the rest of Europe. His bold plan for a united Europe, his enlightened laws and constitutional changes swept away the last vestiges of the feudal age and kept alive some hopes for a new era. But his conquests had cost lives beyond count, and brought misery to the very people he professed to protect.

The peoples of Europe asked themselves: Had the revolution been worth its price? The answer was no. The restoration in France, Metternich's regime in Austria, the birth of a militant nationalism in Germany, clearly *when?* indicated that the hopes for freedom, brotherhood and equality had been abandoned as unachievable dreams. The final blow came when France as a nation disassociated herself from her revolutionary past.

The situation was different in the United States. In spite of its political vacillation, the young nation kept faith with its appointed mission, and it was in part due to this faithfulness that by the end of the 19th century the world started again to believe in a better future.

- 2 -

The First World War disheartened the optimists, and the events which followed implanted a sense of hopelessness into the hearts of millions. The Russian Revolution, which at first had raised hopes, soon turned into an ideology of absolutism. Though pretending to be progressive, it actually reverted to abandoned concepts of the past. The French, when their revolutionary spirit had lost some of its fervor, made use of their ideas for nationalistic purposes. True to this pattern, the Soviets exported their brand of communism to create satellite states while re-establishing a strong nationalistic regime at home. One of their exports went to China where Soviet absolutism combined with native war-lord rule under the leadership of Liu Shao-chi. This form of government proved surprisingly successful for the economic and national rebirth of China.

Then an event took place which may well be unique in world history. Mao Tse-tung, with considerable support from his people, was willing to risk all national and economic gains by unleashing the Cultural Revolution. He replaced the utilitarian "revisionism" of the Russians with a visionary impulse of his own. After the Cultural Revolution had partly succeeded, he embarked on planning a world-wide civilization based on his utopian principles.

By starting the Cultural Revolution, Mao proved how earnest is his wish to change man himself. Unlike Napoleon and Stalin, he refused to use revolutionary ideas as means to a national end. He, too, was a military hero but he did not stop at that. Thus he emerged as an individual leader, implanting ideas into the hearts of his people which proved stronger than their natural desire for economic and nationalistic gain. Studying philosophy for ten years, he revived the

- 3 -

original ideals leading to the French Revolution and grafted them on an ancient dream of China. This dream did not aim at world conquest by force of arms but by example. The first Americans entering the new China hailed him as "the greatest moral leader of the world." James Reston in a recent interview said: "I had no sense of this enormous puritanical, evangelical atmosphere by China...There is a clear connection in their minds between politics and morals...They are trying to change the character of the human race." *

Mao's vision may well be the first and only true challenge to the ideals of the Founding Fathers. But his concept of man and of his moral evolution is diametrically opposed to the individualistic and basically religious nature of the American Dream.

This may be the place for expressing some thoughts on modern man's relationship to history. In order to master today's problems and plan for a better future, we must strive for a deeper understanding of the past. Without such understanding we will remain forever at the mercy of forces we neither control nor comprehend.

Why is it then that for a growing number of young people the study of history has become an exercise in irrelevance and a primary cause for pessimism? Because the results of historical evolution are being forever judged in the light of preconceived ideas. Whenever they fail to measure up to the expectations of the observer, history itself is considered at fault. Moreover, there are two extreme views of history, both -- as all extremes -- misleading.

* As quoted in The New York Post, August 30, 1971.

- 4 -

On one side, there is a strong trend toward oversimplification.

Historians following this trend are wont to place cause and effect in too close proximity. In reality, it takes a long time, often the life-time of a generation, to set decisive historical changes in motion. He who triggers such events is therefore, unknown to himself, their catalyst rather than their creator.

Again, the French Revolution may serve as example. Its impulse, originating with thinkers like Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau, gained slowly momentum, became partly distorted by class hatred, and eventually exploded into violent action. Militant leaders like Danton, Robespierre and Marat were little more than personifications of the passion aroused in the masses. Once the majority of Frenchmen, though still fired by revolutionary zeal, started to tire of violence at home, the great adventure entered a new phase. The mother-land was to be pacified, the aroused militancy of its citizens turned outward and the revolutionary spirit exported to the rest of Europe.

In Napoleon Bonaparte, the French found a man ideally suited to the fulfillment of their goals. If they blindly obeyed his commands, if they willingly sacrificed their lives for his ventures, they did so because he gave expression to their own longings. So overwhelmed was the world with the Napoleonic image that it failed to notice the nearly compulsive nature of his actions. Hitler, too, although on a much lower level, acted like a man possessed. At first he was unfailingly successful, and later on like a sleepwalker proceeded to destroy all he had gained. On close inspection, many of the militant "leaders" of history reveal little individuality of their own but were often tools in the hands of those

- 5 -

whom they thought to control.

In Napoleon and the group of military geniuses surrounding him a frustrated nation had produced the instrument best suited to rebuilding its lost faith in itself. And the dream of Voltaire and Rousseau which could have been a turning point in history ended in a nightmare of violence and war. From the beginning, it had missed an essential element -- a basic knowledge of man. If man is indeed no more than an animal he cannot be free. If, however, he is a spiritual being capable of freedom he will never for long submit to terror or force of arms.

Seeing prominent men, good or bad, in their proper perspective is a prerequisite for a better understanding of history. Students who are taught to overrate the influence of a single individual or a militant group fall easy victim to radicalism. For they are led to believe that, could they themselves ascend to power, they would transform the world. And for such an end all means seem justified.

Of course true leadership does exist but its ways have little semblance to the violent actions of textbook heroes. The true leader does not seek power for power's sake. He knows that an idea implanted into the hearts of the people may take decades or even centuries to ripen. The Founding Fathers in this country, Mahatma Gandhi in India, and Tolstoy and Soloviev in Russia have given examples of such leadership.

- 6 -

In summary, the just mentioned view on history holds that the right man or group in power could quickly set the world in order. The other extreme is based on the conviction that all attempts to improve man's lot have failed in recorded history. Consequently, a mood of hopelessness and inertia prevails among thousands of history students in high schools and colleges. It would far exceed the scope of this chapter to answer this pessimistic view in full, but this much can be said. To me, history is meaningful, and the lessons it has taught me are far from disheartening.

Naturally, the kind of conclusions drawn from the events of the past depends on the viewpoint of the observer. If he expects people of a later era to be wiser or better than those of an earlier one just because they were born a hundred or even a thousand years afterward, he will find history indeed disappointing. He may even discover that ancient achievements in the field of religion, philosophy, art, architecture and agriculture were of a higher order than some technological inventions of our atomic age. He may be hard put to find cultural leaders of today on a level with personalities like Buddha, Moses and Jesus, or modern man's moral concepts with those of the Christian martyrs. Yet disappointing as this lack of apparent progress may be, I consider it a confirmation of the teachings of all great religions. For how could one conceive of man as a spiritual being if his moral development would depend on the time of his birth rather than on his free will.

If history fails to produce morally higher advanced individuals, is it

- 7 -

therefore devoid of meaning? I don't believe so, for it has given us a wealth of experience, an increase in our intellectual and technological capacities, sufficient to build a society better suited for the fulfillment of the material and spiritual needs of all. In the past, not even the best and wisest statesman had at his disposal the means to create such a society. Today, these means exist, and if we do not use them we will have no one but ourselves to blame.

In international relations, too, experience may at last have taught us an all-important lesson: Conquest does not pay. On the surface, the world situation may seem to be even more precarious than ever before. Wars are being waged and the great nations are armed to their teeth. Yet I sincerely believe that today, possibly for the first time in recorded history, no major power desires war. Still, the specter of a third world war has not entirely been banned, but it is caused by suspicion and fear rather than by a spirit of aggression. Thus we may at last have entered a turning point in history. If we succeed in allaying the mistrust of nation against nation, we may bring about a lasting peace: not because mankind has reached a higher state of moral evolution but because history has shown that conquest does not pay.

Historians have never been able to agree whether or not a teleological interpretation of historical evolution is justified. Eras in which a strong religious faith prevailed leaned to the belief that God had set the goal toward which the path of humanity is leading. In sophisticated times like ours, the

- 8 -

trend is to see no purpose or goal in history except that its course is determined by man's selfish interests. Far-fetched as this controversy may appear at first sight, modern man must deal with it since he can no longer afford to drift in uncharted waters. While everyone is of course free to formulate his own ideas, he must arrive at some working hypothesis if he wants to take part in the determination of his future.

It may not be necessary for modern man to visualize the flow of historical evolution as determined by any will but his own. Yet it is not the will of the individual but the subconscious longings of millions which keep the river flowing. When whole nations desire the same goals, the current is strong and swift. When nations or civilizations are at cross purposes, the river becomes turbulent. When, as it can happen, the collective desire of millions reverses itself, the flow of the river may, under certain conditions, change its course. Such conditions occur frequently in history when the aspirations of whole nations undergo a change. A whole era, to give just one example, may long for religious fulfillment, bringing forth saintliness and self-denial. But before the goal is achieved, human nature, too forcefully repressed, will demand its due, and a sudden turn toward luxury, cynicism and agnosticism may occur.

The longing for freedom, I believe, has been a major force of historical evolution. Man's individual choice within the course of destiny was the foremost question asked by the philosophers of Greece. Freedom to worship an

- 9 -

invisible god rather than the Caesars gave countless Christians the courage for martyrdom. The New Age saw the longing for freedom turn toward political liberty. But when, as in the pre-war years of our century, the goal seemed in sight, the fear of its responsibility may reverse the current. Thus, while many revolutions originated in man's longing for freedom, they have often ended in its total loss.

What, then, is the relationship between the collective will and individual self-determination? If it is permissible to continue with our metaphor a little longer, we must say that man's conscious mind, which is his one and only claim to freedom, navigates on the surface of the river. No matter how powerful the undercurrents, man as an individual is never deprived of moral freedom. But he may have no choice in the conduct of his outer life. When the flow is too rapid, as in times of war, revolution or dictatorship, he cannot steer an independent course. The same is true when crosscurrents form such a turbulence that even experienced pilots cannot avert disaster. This may have been the case before the First World War, and when Hitler came to power.

There are, however, moments in history, especially after wars and other upheavals, when the current slackens and the river forks out, permitting freedom of choice. Those are the moments when leadership is crucial. A leader is not an authoritarian who forces others to do his will but a man wise enough to pick the right course and explain to others the reasons for his choice. Yet no leader can fulfill his mission unless he learns to read the book of history and to

- 10 -

recognize the hour of decision. Such opportunities pass quickly and it may take a long and painful journey to arrive at the next crossroads of history.

Today, man is rapidly approaching such a crossroad. His growing ability for intellectual thinking, the vast experience of the past should have taught him at last that his lot cannot be improved by the force of arms. Physical aggression can and at times must be answered by a show of physical strength. However, his ultimate fate depends on a choice between ideas. The American Dream points to one course humanity can choose; Mao's philosophy may offer the alternative.

We should welcome at any moment of history the emergence of at least two ideological courses. For freedom requires choice. The American Dream would lose its essence, its very life, if we were to force it on others by military or economic persuasion. Its value must be proven solely by the example we are giving to the world. Our opponents leave no stone unturned to present their system in the best light. If we downgrade and criticize our system beyond reason, we may fail in our duty to the world. Since the fate of civilization will depend on man's free choice, a clear presentation of the alternatives is of crucial importance.

The hopes of the French idealists died in the violence of the Revolution and the Napoleonic wars. They were reborn in the minds of Marx and Engels, and quenched again under Stalin's regime of terror. In China, Mao revived them in an uncompromising form. To a world tired of wars, economic and

- 11 -

racial struggles, Mao's promise of a society based on equality and fraternity may become an irresistible lure in years to come. But freedom, while he pays lip service to it, cannot be a part of his promise. Freedom is a matter of the spirit and cannot be offered by an ideology denying the soul of man.

In other words, freedom is predominantly a spiritual quality, and its acceptance or refusal will depend on man's concept of himself. If he considers himself a spiritual being, he will shun no sacrifice to remain free; if he considers himself an intellectual animal, he will have to submit to a process of perpetual domination by the more powerful members of the species.

The battle lines in the inevitable war of ideas are gradually taking shape. Soviet Russia may by its own choice remain an enemy or become a friend as a nation. But its system no longer offers a challenge to ours. Our relationship to China, however, is different. With the easing of political tension, with the gradual removal of the Bamboo Curtain it is preparing to challenge us on the battlefield of ideas.

The contest will not be an easy one. Maoism is of such recent origin that all its shortcomings can be blamed on its youth. The Chinese people, looking back on a past of indescribable deprivation, are eagerly accepting a promise of social and economic improvement. They are used to obey; they are diligent and wise. An unprecedented propaganda extolls the achievements of Mao's thoughts. Americans, on the other hand, divided by racial strife and ashamed

- 12 -

of political actions not always compatible with the ideals of the American Dream, have become the severest critics of their own country.

Personally, I have no doubt that if the battle of ideals is fought fairly, our system must win. For it offers freedom, without which man cannot preserve his humanity. But to allow the world a free choice, we must not only be honest in our self-criticism but also fair to ourselves.

In the next chapters I wish to discuss the progress made on the way toward our goal. Our accomplishments are so numerous that one book could never suffice to do them justice. I shall therefore select only a few examples which I consider pertinent enough to revive the faith of Americans in their country.

First, however, we must separate justified criticism from recriminations not fully deserved. To evaluate the achievements of our system correctly, we must take into account some of the following factors.

From the very beginning, we have been accused of hypocrisy because of undeniable contradictions between the ideals of the Founding Fathers and the realities of our political actions. But what critics overlook is that ideals cannot be translated into action until they have transformed the people who are to apply them. A political system built on ideals can indeed exert a wholesome effect on its citizens and provide a framework within which individual self-realization can be achieved. Yet nobody with any knowledge of human nature can expect this to happen within the life span of a few generations.

- 13 -

The founders of this country were wise men. They knew that the people for whom they devised the most idealistic system in history were by no means better than their brothers and sisters anywhere else in the world. Many of the early settlers were adventurers, reckless individualists, inclined to serve their own interest at the expense of the nature and native population of the New World. The inhumanity of slavery was accepted; intolerance and prejudice were rampant. In spite of all these facts, the founders, with the support of the people, designed a constitution based on what man should be rather than what he then was and in many ways still is today. Consequently, the American Dream combines an almost mystical faith in man with the most realistic system designed to help him achieve his moral potential.

Have events refuted this faith in man? I don't believe they have. The United States is still very young, for the 200 years of its history are no more than formative years for a nation of its size and potentials. Moreover, from the outset it was beset with some of the severest trials any country has had to face. Contrary to other big countries like Canada, Australia or New Zealand, the nation did not reserve its spiritual and physical resources for the benefit of its original population and their offspring. Instead, it invited and welcomed an influx of immigrants at the risk of importing foreign customs and impulses not always beneficial to its still fragile structure.

A nation is a living organism, an organism which is subject to the cycle

- 14 -

of birth, growth, maturity and eventual death like every other living being. The greater a country's role in world history is to be, the longer will it need to reach maturity. Seen from this point of view, the United States has barely outgrown its childhood years. Consequently, its position as world leader may be premature.

The critics from within and without its borders should remember, however, that it was not the United States or its people who craved world leadership. On the contrary, Americans are ever ready to look to other countries for inspiration, cultural and even political guidance. They have opened their borders to foreigners and, where possible, given them positions of leadership. With regard to international affairs, hardly any other big nation has been so reluctant to grasp power or so candid in admitting its own inadequacies as the United States. World power has been forced on the United States prematurely by the failure of older and more experienced nations to fulfill their duty to the world.

In view of all this and of America's tremendous human and material sacrifices in foreign wars, its progress toward its still distant goal is little short of miraculous.

Today, our country is confronted with problems which shake its foundations. But it is the very magnitude, the unprecedented complexity of these problems which, I believe, will force us to mature. Faced with the choice of making our dream come true or seeing our world destroyed, we will be com-

- 15 -

pelled to do the kind of reappraisal, re-evaluation and fundamental change which alone can bring about a turning point in history.

Solutions to our problems exist. They may be painful, they may even demand a complete renewal of political thinking. In order to find these solutions, we need an objective analysis of conditions as they really --- based on a clear understanding of the achievements and errors of the past. And to begin with we must learn to distinguish between two aspects of modern man's ordeals. One is a universal illness affecting the human spirit, manifested in racial prejudice, drug addiction, unmotivated crime, withdrawal from life and mistrust between the old and young, an illness that can be healed only in co-operation with the rest of the world. The other is the state of health of our own nation.

From the start we must face the fact that a system like ours, intended to grant the greatest possible degree of liberty to all, is extremely vulnerable to attacks by those who deliberately take advantage of its permissiveness for their selfish ends. To correct this misuse of liberty, adjustments in the judiciary may be urgently needed, but it is not so much the political system which is at fault as the flaws in human nature. For while the Founding Fathers realized this fact and left the doors wide open for necessary changes, there is no way to protect any institution against the corruption of those entrusted with its care.

In spite of international tension, the American system today is, in my opinion, well fortified against assault from without --- but it is highly vulnerable to attacks from within. Such attacks are especially dangerous when originating

- 16 -

with idealists whose one-time love for the United States has turned into disillusionment --- possibly because our system has indeed failed to keep pace with the rapidly changing times. Enmity from idealistic though misguided people cannot be assuaged by police action but only by meaningful communication based on compassionate understanding and clear thinking. For even if we did succeed in preventing violent action against the "Establishment," the nation needs more than pacification; it needs the wholehearted support of the most idealistic of its citizens. There is only one way to win this support and this is to clarify the degree of our success, separate setbacks beyond our control from our own failings and seek for ways of correcting the latter. To do this, one need not be a professional historian but merely an American deeply concerned for his country. In my own case, I claim no qualification other than this concern and my personal experience. Twenty four years of public service in international and national affairs have given me the privilege of observing the making of modern history at close quarters and, at times, of taking an active part in it.

The storm clouds of disillusionment gathering over our country demand that those whose political experience has strengthened rather than undermined their faith in the American Dream will explain their reasons for not losing their faith while still in active life. As far as I am concerned, I have learnt that most ills blamed by Americans on their own system exist in other parts of the world, symptoms of modern man's spiritual disease. This disease, possibly caused by the twentieth century's rapidly widening gap between man's moral

- 17 -

stamina and technological power, raises the age-old question of good and evil. We must remember that good and evil belong in the area of individual conscience rather than government. Only if every citizen would learn to pay more attention to the human and moral qualities of political candidates, would he get the kind of government he deserves. Political inertia or self-interest on the part of the individual voter is responsible for evil in government and vice versa. In other words, good and evil in a nation's government are amplified reflections of the good and evil in the majority of its citizens.

Authoritarian ideologies take the opposite view. They hold that a man (or a group of men) strong enough to usurp power, have the right to determine what is good and evil and to force people to accept their "moral" standards. Here again is an example of the animalistic view of totalitarianism, because authoritarian methods simulate the laws of the flock, in which the strongest male usurps leadership and determines the rules of society.

Before attempting to make a partial analysis of America's accomplishments and failures, I should like to emphasize one point. No contemporary writer can be entirely objective when dealing with his own time and country. He must be on his guard against making his own convictions yardsticks for success and failure. He cannot afford to repeat the misjudgements which historians have made so often before. How many rulers have been called great for the very deeds which brought about the decline of their countries. To pick some examples at random: Louis XIV's, the Sun King's celebrated victories, caused the bankruptcy of France.

- 18 -

Agricultural countries, especially successful in rapid industrialization, often became the victims of seemingly incurable socio-economic woes. Or look at the combatants of World War II and their relative standing in the world today, and see how difficult it is to come to an objective judgment on success and failure.

There is only one way to evaluate historical issues, and this is an analysis of the progress made toward the goals that a nation itself professes to pursue. In our case, these goals are contained in the American Dream: they are called freedom, brotherhood and equality. Let us consider each of them in sequence.